

Portions of this report have been redacted in order to comply with The *Local Authority Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act*.

# **CITY OF REGINA**

## **REVIEW of CITY SQUARE PROJECT MANAGEMENT**

**PREPARED BY T. BAKKELI CONSULTANTS INC.  
MARCH 2, 2012**

## Contents

Executive Summary.....	1
Background to the Review .....	2
Review Objectives .....	4
Review Approach .....	4
Review Scope .....	5
Acknowledgements.....	7
Conclusions .....	7
Recommendations for Project Management .....	10
Lessons Learned .....	21
Recommendations Regarding This Report And Future Projects .....	21

## Executive Summary

The objective of the City Square Project (the “Project”) was to provide a hard surface space that would take pressure off Victoria Park’s green spaces while providing a shared space for vehicles and traffic. As well, it was viewed as a key way to demonstrate the City’s commitment to the Downtown Neighbourhood Plan.

The Project was constructed behind schedule, over budget, and has not yet delivered the expected result – a dual use plaza and roadway. The City Square is closed to vehicular traffic, pending the results of a traffic study. A programming strategy has yet not been developed, and the plaza lacks some of the functionality needed for programming.

Three major factors negatively impacted the project: wet weather, limited information about the underground infrastructure, and incomplete project planning.

The following are significant project management deficiencies that contributed to the failure to complete the Project on time, within budget and with the expected deliverables:

1. There was weak application of project management methodology. Although this was a relatively large, complex project there was no business case, insufficient project planning, and a lack of project documentation regarding project changes.
2. The project governance and decision making structure identified in the draft project charter was not followed.
3. The three key project decision makers in Phase 1, the Executive Sponsor, Chair of the Steering Committee and Project Manager were all from the City’s Planning department. Given that the project was intended for joint usage as both a roadway and programmable space; and that Planning normally does not build nor operate facilities, consideration should have been given to including more balance in the project governance and decision making structure.
4. The risk related to complex underground utility and City infrastructure was underestimated. Because of this, risk management strategies such as an alternate form of construction contract or more intensive information gathering were not pursued.

14 (1) (d) - existing or anticipated legal proceedings

6. There was a perceived unwillingness to identify, discuss, or report issues. Therefore, they were left unaddressed or were unable to access the resources needed.

Lessons learned and detailed recommendations to improve future project management are provided in this report.

## Background to the Review

The Project was announced in January 2008 as the “WOW Project” and mostly completed by the fall of 2011.

The intent of the Project was to provide a hard surface space that would take pressure off Victoria Park’s green spaces while providing a shared space for vehicles and traffic. As well, it was viewed as a key way to demonstrate the City’s commitment to the Downtown Neighbourhood Plan.

The Project is located in the heart of downtown, making it highly visible to the public. The Project significantly impacted the public, both during construction and after completion due to the impact on transit, other vehicular traffic and plaza/park usage. Project execution required input from several divisions. The location has significant underground utility and City infrastructure. These factors make it a complex project.

The Project was constructed behind schedule, over budget, and has not yet delivered the expected result – a dual use plaza and roadway. The City Square is closed to vehicular traffic, pending the results of a traffic study. A programming strategy has not been developed, and the plaza lacks some programming and possibly maintenance functionality.

Throughout this report, Phase 1 (January 2008 to October 2010) refers to the period when the project was managed by the City’s Planning & Sustainability Division. Phase 2 (October 2010 to the present) refers to the period when the project was co-managed by the Planning & Sustainability Division and the Development Engineering Division. Because responsibility for the Project has not yet been transferred to the ultimate owner, the report does not comment significantly on project closing activities.

In July of 2010, the Executive Sponsor became more aware of the severity of the issues the Project was experiencing. This led to significantly more involvement by him, a change in the project sponsor, and introduction of co-project managers. More rigorous project status reporting and issue management were introduced.

The following is a summary of key activities in Phase 1 and 2:

<b>Phase 1</b>	<b>Phase 2</b>
Initiate project	Terminate consultant
Create draft project charter	Engage subcontractors
Obtain budget approval	Revise design
Engage consultant (Cohlmeyer Architects Limited)	Implement interim winter plan for plaza
Create conceptual master plan (design)	Finish construction
Engage construction firm (PCL)	Stakeholder communications
Begin construction	
Revise design	
Stakeholder communications	

A summary time line is provided below:

<b>PHASE 1</b>	
Jan-08	Mayor announces City Square Project (Downtown WOW)
Mar-08	First project manager (Planning & Sustainability) appointed
Jun-08	Consultant RFP issued
Nov-08	First project status report to Project Executive Sponsor
Dec-08	Project manager plans to request a formal project management plan from consultant
Dec-08	Draft charter completed (never formally approved)
Dec-08	Steering Committee established
Dec-08	Articulated need to assess "whether downtown traffic will function with the City Square closed to traffic"
Dec-08	Underground data received or soon to be requested from utilities
Jan-09	Consultant engaged (4 months behind schedule in RFP)
Jan-09	Recognition that funds insufficient (submission to Council for extra funding)
Sep-09	Council approves Downtown Neighbourhood Plan
Oct-09	One year construction season known as high risk (DW)
? Dec -09	Detailed design complete
Mar-10	Request to Development Engineering for Comments regarding design (allowing 2 days for response)
Apr-10	Construction tender approved (12+ months behind schedule in consultant RFP)
Apr-10	Construction tender awarded (April 28)
Jun-10	Construction contract executed (June 1)
Jun-10	Construction starts (13 months behind schedule in consultant RFP)
Jun-10	Project manager aware but unable to resolve contractor and consultant issues
Jul-10	Second project manager (Planning & Sustainability) replaces first
Jul-10	First time status reports "yellow" issues. Underground utilities, outstanding RFI's from PCL identified as concern

Aug-10	Completion date extended to 2011
Sep-10	First red reporting on status reports (cost). Schedule and scope still half green
Oct-10	First time utilities shown as red in status reports
PHASE 2	
Oct-10	Joint project management by Planning & Sustainability (second project manager) and Development Engineering (third project manager)
Oct-10	Monthly reporting begins
Dec-10	Consultant terminated
Feb-11	Master task list created
Mar-11	Electrical, structural, on site consulting contracts awarded
April-11	P3 Architectural Firm engaged
Sept-11	Last project status report

## Review Objectives

The City Manager engaged T. Bakkeli Consultants Inc. to provide an independent and systematic review of the project management methods used. The review provides recommendations that can be applied to improve future project management.

“Project management” is the application of knowledge, skills, tools and techniques to project activities to meet project requirements. It includes processes to initiate, plan, execute, monitor and close a project.

## Review Approach

The Executive Sponsor, Jason Carlston was the liaison for the review project.

Primary sources of information were project documents and interviews with members of the project team, functional experts, and three external stakeholders.

## Review Scope

The table below describes project documents reviewed:

1. Brochure that accompanied the Mayor's initial announcement of the project
2. Draft project charter
3. Downtown Neighbourhood Plan – project organization
4. Summary of stakeholder (both internal and external) engagement (dates, attendees)
5. Status updates for the Project and the Downtown Neighbourhood Plan Program
6. Documents provided to City Council for either approval or status reporting
7. The RFP for consultants
8. Consultant contract
9. The construction tender
10. Construction contract
11. Project change orders
12. City policies or procedures regarding project management and purchasing

Additional documents such as the project plan were requested but not provided.

Documents such as project minutes retained by the consultant were not requested.

Individuals interviewed included:

Interview	Position	Project Role
	<b>City of Regina</b>	
Jason Carlston (long)	Deputy City Manager Community Planning & Development	Executive Sponsor (draft project charter)
Chris Sale (long)	Sr. City Planner (Downtown)Planning & Sustainability	Project Manager, March 2008 – July 2010
Denise Donahue (long)	Sr. City Planner Planning & Sustainability	Project Manager – July – October, 2010 Joint Project Manager – October 2010 - present
Max Zasada (long)	Project Engineer Development Engineering	Joint project manager (October 2010 to present)
Kelly Wyatt (long)	Director Development Engineering	Functional input Replacement to Bob Bjerke, Chair of Steering Committee
Janine Daradich / Glen Gordon (short)	Infrastructure Strategy Coordinator Community Services	Functional input
Pat Gartner (short)	Director Facilities Management Services	Functional input



<b>Interview</b>	<b>Position</b>	<b>Project Role</b>
Karen Gasmo (short)	Director Transportation & Material Services	Steering Committee (draft project charter)
Chris Holden (short)	Director Community Services	Steering Committee (draft project charter)
Natosha Lipinski (short)	Manager Public Involvement Strategy Management (Communications)	Communications Support to Planning and Development
Sue Luchuk (short)	Sr. Transit Planner Transit	Replacement for David Onodera - Steering Committee (draft project charter)
Neil Vandendort (short)	Director Parks and Open Space	Steering Committee (draft project charter)
Dalton Wudrich (short)	Special Projects Consultant City Operations	Program manager for Downtown Neighbourhood Plan
Tom O'Connell / Tamara Christensen (short)	Traffic Control & Parking	Functional input
Fred Clipsham (short - telephone)	City Councillor	
Michael Fougere (short - telephone)	City Councillor	
Mike O'Donnell (short - telephone)	City Councillor	
	<b>External</b>	
Steve Enns (short)	Vice President and GM Harvard Property Management	External stakeholder
Garth Tomlinson, Jarrod Keuler (short)	Projects Managers, PCL Construction Management	Construction manager
Judith Veresuk, Colin Perkowitsch (short)	Executive Director / Chair Regina Downtown Bus. Improvement District	Steering Committee (draft project charter) – replacement for Michael Huber

Interviews were not requested with the consultant, the sub-contractors, other stakeholders or the original chair (Director, Planning & Sustainability) of the Project's steering committee.

The long and short interview guides are attached.

## Acknowledgements

The cooperation of those interviewed is appreciated. Participants expressed concern over the project, and indicated a desire to hear the results of the review process with a view to improving future project management.

There are many within the City who have experience in project management. As well, there has been considerable effort to implement tools and techniques to support project management, especially for the corporate priority projects. This expertise could be used to supplement the recommendations included in this report.

## Conclusions

Three major factors delayed the project **schedule**:

1. Weather – the 2010 construction season was one of the wettest on record. This was beyond the project team's control.
2. Limited information about underground infrastructure. The location chosen has extensive underground infrastructure, some of which is old. The project manager identified the need for utility information by Dec. 2008. Information obtained from the utilities was incomplete and inaccurate. This risk of poor quality information was understood by Development Engineering and other divisions involved with the project. Although the risk was significant, few options for risk mitigation were pursued (e.g. involvement of City personnel with experience working with the utilities, ground penetrating radar, more integration of design and construction).
3. Incomplete project planning. Proceeding to and continuing with construction without adequate planning created the need for rework, resulting in delays.

Many interviewed commented positively on the appearance of the plaza. However, the project **scope** was negatively impacted by the construction delays and the constraints created by the underground infrastructure. There are concerns about safety on the plaza due to design changes (e.g. street configuration, removal of bollards and tactile changes to delineate vehicular and pedestrian zones). Concerns have been expressed about the potential impact of vehicles and related maintenance requirements on the pavers and the artistic lights. As well at this time, the plaza will not accommodate all the expected programming. For example, the rink is not in the planned location due to grading, and large festival tents cannot be easily erected. It has not yet been opened to vehicular traffic.

**Costs** overruns resulted from the current economic boom as well as the same factors that delayed project schedule. Much of the time and money spent on design and construction before adequately investigating the underground infrastructure was wasted.

The following are significant project management deficiencies that contributed to the failure to complete the Project on time, within budget and with the expected deliverables:

1. There was weak application of project management methodology. The draft project charter contemplated a cross-functional project with a budget in excess of \$7 million. The project was intended to be high profile and to significantly change public perceptions of the use of downtown. A new concept, naked street design, was introduced. Project execution required input from several divisions. These factors indicate a complex project and a need to use formal project management tools and techniques. Phase 1 of this project had no business case, no signed charter, no project plan other than dates included in supplier contracts and the draft charter, few formal status reports, lack of documented minutes from project management meetings and lack of documentation regarding project issues and decisions. Phase 2 had more rigour regarding status reporting and issue management.
2. The project governance and decision making structure identified in the draft project charter was not followed in either phase. A steering committee with representation from most key areas was included in the draft charter but this steering committee was not used to govern the project. In Phase 1, too much weight was placed on design elements. In Phase 2, emphasis was on getting the Project built. In both phases, the project governance lacked representation from key areas. This likely contributed to functional deficiencies in the end product.
3. In Phase 1, the three key project decision makers, the Executive Sponsor, Chair of the Steering Committee and the Project Manager were all from Planning & Sustainability. Because the project was intended for joint usage as both a roadway and programmable space; and the Planning division normally does not build nor operate facilities, consideration should have been given to including more balance in the project governance and decision making structure. In Phase 2, the Executive Sponsor remained, but the project was managed by Development Engineering (Project Manager, Sponsor) and Planning & Sustainability (Project Manager).
4. There was insufficient project planning. Project tasks, roles, responsibilities, schedules, deliverables, change processes, and issue management were not sufficiently defined or updated over the project. Interdependencies were not identified, including the need to resolve issues between the competing needs of multi-functional space.

14 (1) (d) - existing or anticipated legal proceedings

14 (1) (d) - existing or anticipated legal proceedings

7. There was a perceived unwillingness to identify, discuss, or report issues. Therefore, they were left unaddressed or were unable to access the resources needed.

Although, by definition, each project is unique, there are well established project management tools and techniques available. The City's decision makers should ensure the project management methodology used and project manager and team chosen are appropriate given the size, scope and complexity of the project.

The following section provides recommendations for future projects based on the lessons learned from this project.

Definitions that apply to the terms used in the chart are as follows:

1. Project initiation - Processes that formally authorize the start of a new project.
2. Project planning - Plan the course of action to attain the objectives. Identify scope, cost, schedule, requirements, dependencies and risks. Develop a project plan.
3. Project Execution - integrate people and other resources to carry out the plan. Ensure work defined in the project plan is done and deliverables are produced as outlined in the project plan. Engage suppliers. Build to plan, or obtain approval for changes.
4. Project monitoring and reporting - Measure and monitor progress to identify variances from the project management plan so that corrective action can be taken. Identify and report issues.
5. Project closing – Obtain formal acceptance of the product and bring the project to an orderly end.

The first column in the chart provides the recommendation, the second column describes Project practices, and the third column provides support for the recommendation from project management methodology.

## Recommendations for Project Management

RECOMMENDATION	CITY SQUARE PROJECT	PROJECT MANAGEMENT PRACTICES
1. PROJECT INITIATION		
a. Clarify processes for project initiation and authorization	Initial communication was from the Mayor in Jan. 2008, following reports on the downtown plan from the Office of Urbanism. This may have created confusion regarding the flexibility for project design, schedule and deliverables.	Initiation starts the process of authorizing and identifying the scope of a new project. The project sponsor is usually identified at this stage and should be appropriate to the business need and funding source.
b. Require signed project charter that meets project management standards	<p>Signed charter not available. Draft charter – Jan. 2009:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Purpose - Add infrastructure to reduce pressure on Victoria Park, signal commitment to downtown plan</li> <li>• Limited identification of customers' and stakeholders' requirements (internal)</li> <li>• Good input planned from external stakeholders</li> <li>• Product is to accommodate festivals and vehicular traffic.</li> <li>• Cross functional steering committee and project team. Gaps include Facilities and Development Engineering</li> <li>• Milestones identified, including construction schedule – April – Sept. 2010</li> <li>• No meaningful risks or assumptions. No constraints or business case. The complexity and impact of the project is not addressed. Underground infrastructure risk not addressed.</li> <li>• City has a business case template but it was neither required nor applied to this project</li> <li>• Preliminary budget of \$6.8 million.</li> <li>• Limited analysis of alternatives. Process for selecting 12<sup>th</sup> Ave. rather than Scarth, Cornwall or Lorne St. appears to have been recommendations from the Office of Urbanism and input from the public forum</li> <li>• Limited communications plan</li> </ul>	<p>Project charters provide authority to apply resources to the project.</p> <p>Project charters should be developed by the initial project team and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Business need /project purpose</li> <li>• Customers' and stakeholders' requirements</li> <li>• High level product requirements, expected benefits or results (quality and scope)</li> <li>• Project team</li> <li>• Milestones (schedule)</li> <li>• Support required from organization</li> <li>• Risk assessment</li> <li>• Assumptions and constraints</li> <li>• Business case including alternatives considered</li> <li>• Budget, including appropriate contingencies</li> <li>• Governance and decision making structure (issue escalation, change management)</li> <li>• Communication plan</li> </ul>

RECOMMENDATION	CITY SQUARE PROJECT	PROJECT MANAGEMENT PRACTICES
c. Design clear governance structure that shows accountabilities and is designed to ensure the project is completed successfully. Clearly identify ownership of the project – who is accountable for ensuring the project achieves intended results. Identify the “owner” after project execution	<p>Draft charter identifies some roles and responsibilities. Functional support required not specifically included (e.g. Facilities, Development Engineering).</p> <p>Description of executive sponsor’s role does not include accountability for project deliverables (delegated to Steering Committee).</p> <p>Draft charter identifies Planning &amp; Sustainability will fill the 3 key roles (Executive Sponsor, Chair of the Steering Committee and Project Manager) for a construction project that will create programmable space and roadways.</p> <p>Owner after project execution not identified.</p> <p>No formal documentation regarding changes from Phase 1 to Phase 2 governance structure.</p>	<p>Project charter serves as a contract between the sponsor and the team.</p> <p>Expect information included in the project charter will be refined in future documentation (e.g. project plan).</p>
d. Involve customers and stakeholders	<p>Prior to this project, and in its early stages, there was significant stakeholder consultation. Many interviewed commented positively on this.</p>	<p>All internal and external stakeholders who will be involved in or impacted by the project should be identified. A plan for interaction should be developed. Appropriate input should be obtained.</p>

RECOMMENDATION	CITY SQUARE PROJECT	PROJECT MANAGEMENT PRACTICES
2. PROJECT PLANNING		
a. Allow adequate time for planning	The duration from the draft charter to construction start was 18 months. The duration from engagement of the consultant to construction start was also 18 months.	Project changes are usually less expensive when identified early. Allowing adequate time allows plans to be developed in detail and based on accurate information
b. Develop and document a project plan that meets project management standards	<p>The consultant provided a high level project schedule in his proposal.</p> <p>14 (1) (d) - existing or anticipated legal proceedings</p> <p>The Construction Tender includes construction requirements. The design developed was not followed due to the failure to include underground infrastructure constraints. A stakeholder communication plan was developed. Competencies and time required from project team members and functional support were not identified. Early in Phase 2, a master task list was created.</p>	<p>Project plans:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clearly define the project objectives, scope, cost and schedules.</li> <li>Break phases into activities and tasks</li> <li>Identify dependencies, requirements and risks</li> <li>Identify competencies and time required from project team members and functional support</li> </ul> <p>There should be a clear definition of what will be included in the deliverable.</p>
c. Recognize linkages with other key projects	A program manager for the Downtown Neighbourhood Plan was appointed.	A management plan is required for interdependent projects. Often, this is program management.
d. Update project plans throughout the project as project changes are approved	<p>Significant cost changes were documented.</p> <p>Changes to schedule, design and deliverables have weak documentation.</p> <p>Scope and schedule changes appear to have been approved most often by the project managers but are not well documented.</p>	Project plans need to be updated over the life of the project as new information is gathered.

RECOMMENDATION	CITY SQUARE PROJECT	PROJECT MANAGEMENT PRACTICES
e. If not included in charter, complete risk assessment including identification of risk management strategies	<p>Risk identification and mitigation strategies appear to have been minimal. They were not documented.</p> <p>The risk related to the underground utility infrastructure was ignored or underestimated. Inadequate information was collected prior to the construction tender. Based on the City's knowledge of both 12<sup>th</sup> Ave. underground infrastructure and the utility companies' business practices, the risk should have been assessed higher and more effort should have been applied to getting good quality information.</p> <p>14 (1) (d) - existing or anticipated legal proceedings</p>	High quality risk assessment at the planning stage contributes to improved change management since identifying risks early normally allows more cost-effective risk management.
f. Use internal expertise to develop procurement strategies	<p>28 (1) &amp; 23 (1) (f), 14 (1) (d) - existing or anticipated legal proceedings</p> <p>Master plan and construction tenders were issued. Purchasing supported the procurement process. Limited input appears to have been sought from those with more construction experience.</p> <p>A sequential approach (i.e. complete design, then engage construction firm) was used. This meant the constraints related to construction needed to be identified early. There were 3 bidders for the master plan and 2 bidders for construction.</p> <p>The consultant chosen to develop the master plan and provide construction management was from Winnipeg.</p> <p>14 (1) (d) - existing or anticipated legal proceedings</p>	Senior level stakeholders with appropriate competencies should provide input regarding type of procurement and bid requirements. This contributes to risk management as well as ensuring a good competition



RECOMMENDATION	CITY SQUARE PROJECT	PROJECT MANAGEMENT PRACTICES
g. Identify both internal and external stakeholders. Build a communications plan that addresses how input will be sought and information provided	An external stakeholder plan was developed and implemented for Phase 1. External communications were more ad hoc in Phase 2 due to the construction challenges. Inadequate attention was paid to internal stakeholders in both phases.	Include both internal and external stakeholders. Stakeholders have knowledge and skills that can be leveraged in developing the project plan. The project team should create an environment in which all stakeholders can contribute appropriately.
h. Identify process for escalation of issues and approvals of changes	An issues log was not maintained in Phase 1. Changes to schedule and scope were mostly approved by the Executive Sponsor, Sponsor, or Project Manager.	The governance and decision making framework should identify issue resolution processes.
i. Identify project monitoring and reporting processes	Status reports were to be provided weekly to the Steering Committee, with reports to the Executive Leadership Team at key milestones.	Up front definition of project monitoring and reporting processes builds in accountability.
j. Include appropriate contingencies	The construction contract had a \$200,000 or 2%, contingency which is viewed as light given the complexity and risks associated with the underground infrastructure. The project was over \$3 million (>33%) over budget.	Contingencies should reflect project size, complexity and risk

RECOMMENDATION	CITY SQUARE PROJECT	PROJECT MANAGEMENT PRACTICES
3. PROJECT EXECUTION		
a. Commence project execution only after developing adequate project plans	14 (1) (d) - existing or anticipated legal proceedings	Normal approach for a fixed price contract would be functional design, review and revisions, detailed design, review and revisions, then tendering.
b. Ensure project manager has leadership ability, experience, time and technical competency to lead the project	28 (1) & 23 (1) (f), 14 (1) (d) - existing or anticipated legal proceedings  14 (1) (d) - existing or anticipated legal proceedings	The size, scope and complexity of the project should be considered when selecting the project manager.
c. Recruit and orient the project team	The Phase 1 project team lacked expertise in construction or programming. 28 (1) & 23 (1) (f)  Assigning co-project team members in Phase 2 improved project management. 14 (1) (d) - existing or anticipated legal proceedings	Cross-functional, complex projects require a wide variety of functional expertise. Project kick-off should ensure all members understand the project plan, and accept their roles and responsibilities. The project manager should identify the resources required and obtain commitments.

RECOMMENDATION	CITY SQUARE PROJECT	PROJECT MANAGEMENT PRACTICES
	<p>The Phase 1 project team overemphasized design and aesthetics. The Phase 2 project team overemphasized getting the Project built. The end result has not yet accommodated traffic (location of artistic lights, safety issues of naked street, and does not meet programming needs– i.e. improper grading for preferred rink location, improper facilities for tents.</p> <p>Input from Roadways, Traffic, Facilities, Community Services, and Communications was either not sought or acted upon.</p>	
d. Define and implement the change control process (for changes in scope, budget, quality or budget).	<p>Project governance was not followed. Steering committee meetings were rare.</p> <p>The processes for making change were unclear.</p> <p>Changes in scope, quality and schedule were not adequately documented.</p> <p>Changes in budget were documented.</p>	<p>A change control process should be identified during project planning for changes that affect the scope, quality, schedule or budget. The Project Manager should implement and manage the change control process. Not doing so causes confusion as to what constitutes a change. The change control process also helps balance the requirements of the project and the timeline and cost.</p>
e. Manage issues	<p>The process for escalating issues was unclear. For example, the executive sponsor became aware of the impact of the design choices and the underground infrastructure directly from PCL. The Phase 1 status reports from both the Project and the Downtown Neighbourhood Plan fail to convey the severity of the problem.</p> <p>Although some issues are noted in the project status reports, a comprehensive issues log was not maintained in Phase 1.</p> <p>Some interviewed felt the project was “special” because it had been announced by the Mayor and approved by Council.</p> <p><small>14 (1) (d) - existing or anticipated legal proceedings</small></p>	<p>Managing issues involves documenting, reporting, escalating, and resolving problems.</p> <p>The project manager and sponsor need to foster an environment where communicating issues is not only acceptable but strongly encouraged.</p>

RECOMMENDATION	CITY SQUARE PROJECT	PROJECT MANAGEMENT PRACTICES
f. Manage transition in project team members	The handoff between project managers was difficult due to lack of documentation (no plan, no status reporting, no minutes, etc.) and the project status.	Good documentation is needed to support transition.
g. Assess project at key milestones	There is no documentation of Steering Committee reviews of key milestone deliverables. 14 (1) (d) - existing or anticipated legal proceedings	Breaking complex projects into key milestones often improves project execution and control.
h. Communicate with stakeholders	Phase 1 had significant input from external stakeholders. As the project progressed, communication with stakeholders decreased. External stakeholders were getting much of their information through the media. Internal stakeholders were not obtaining regular project status reports. Phase 2 received mixed reviews from external stakeholders. Most who were interviewed were surprised by the decision to close the plaza to traffic pending a traffic study.	Required information should be made available to the appropriate stakeholders at the appropriate times.
i. Implement financial reporting systems and processes that provide reliable information about project status	Project managers reported difficulty in using the City's financial systems for budgeting and tracking purposes. A Project ledger/budget tracking spreadsheet was created by the Phase 2 project manager.	Monitoring the project budget requires current information about the contract value, costs incurred to date, and estimated costs to complete.

RECOMMENDATION	CITY SQUARE PROJECT	PROJECT MANAGEMENT PRACTICES
j. Engage suppliers	<p>The Project engaged its two key suppliers on a sequential basis, using separate processes. 14 (1) (d) - existing or anticipated legal proceedings</p> <p>The City took on the role of prime contractor in Phase 2.</p>	Gaps in internal competencies or capacity should be filled with competent suppliers.
k. Oversee suppliers	<p>14 (1) (d) - existing or anticipated legal proceedings</p> <p>The City established a good working relationship with the construction firm.</p>	Contract management is a critical skill for complex projects.

RECOMMENDATION	CITY SQUARE PROJECT	PROJECT MANAGEMENT PRACTICES
4. PROJECT MONITORING AND REPORTING		
a. Measure and report scope, schedule, budget and quality variances. Document information at a level that meets project management standards	<p>From Nov. 2008 to July 2010, project status project reports were provided sporadically.</p> <p>Most project reporting from the first project manager to the project sponsors was verbal and informal. The scope of issues and the variance in schedule, scope, and quality is not evident from the Phase 1 status reports.</p> <p>The DNP Program Manager reported Project status from Jan. to Sept. 2010. The severity of Project issues are not clearly articulated in these reports.</p> <p>14 (1) (d) - existing or anticipated legal proceedings</p>	During project planning, an agreed-upon baseline is established for the project scope, schedule, budget and quality. This should be used as a starting point against which performance on the project will be measured and reported. It is one of many tools used to determine and communicate if the project is on track.
b. Monitor and report risks	<p>The impact of weather delays in 2010 on a tight construction schedule was largely beyond the project team's control</p> <p>The risk related to poor utility information became an issue to be managed early on in the project.</p>	During planning, events that could negatively impact the project should be identified. As the project progresses, the probability and impact of risks should be continuously re-evaluated. When a risk event occurs, it becomes an "issue" and issue management takes over.
c. Schedule project team meetings at appropriate intervals to determine and share project status.	<p>No documentation was provided about project team meetings beyond those with the project sponsor.</p> <p>Interaction with functional experts appears to have been informal or not well documented.</p> <p>Those interviewed indicated there was conflict in Phase 1 among City functional experts asked for input. These conflicts do not appear to have been documented, escalated or resolved.</p>	The Project Manager should continuously communicate to each member what is required and by when, and then manage the performance of team members in meeting the requirements.

RECOMMENDATION	CITY SQUARE PROJECT	PROJECT MANAGEMENT PRACTICES
5. PROJECT CLOSING		
a. Formally terminate project and transfer the completed project to the owner - Manage acceptance of deliverables	As of February, 2012, the Project is still being managed by Planning and has not yet transferred to City Operations or Community Services or Facilities. No programming strategy has been developed. Deficiencies have been identified related to programming, maintenance and operations (E.g. stage lights inadequate; cannot pitch large tents; no washrooms; rinks not be located where intended, limited access to “as built” drawings).	Execution is complete when the project is fully developed, tested, accepted and transitioned to the “customer/owner”.
b. Close contracts	14 (1) (d) - existing or anticipated legal proceedings	
c. Conduct project evaluation for lessons learned	This review provides a first step.	Post project debriefings are a valuable source of information for future projects.

## Lessons Learned

Key lessons learned from the management of this Project include:

1. Identify the scope of the project and clearly define deliverables early. They are the foundation for all future project decisions. Although the objective of this Project was broad, it was primarily managed as a construction project.
2. If risks and issues are not discussed, they can't be managed.
3. When functional areas don't collaborate effectively, the likelihood of success is reduced.
4. Create a project team with the competencies and time to plan and execute their project.
5. Status reporting is not project management.
6. Without a project plan, it is difficult to determine and gain commitment for the required human resources. It is also difficult to control scope, deliverables, schedule and budgets.
7. Program management is not project management.

## Recommendations Regarding This Report And Future Projects

This project experienced many challenges. Many were due to project management deficiencies, and are addressed above. Some may have been related to the timing of the Project, following closely on significant organization changes. Some were beyond the control of the project team.

The lessons learned and recommendations would be helpful for future large complex projects, and for projects in general. It is recommended they be shared with:

1. Those closely involved with the Project. This session should:
  - a. Include the Executive Sponsor, all project managers, and all functional experts who had significant involvement.
  - b. Be designed to encourage discussion. This would allow "the air to be cleared" and pave the way for future cooperation.
  - c. Be designed with recognition that the results of the review may generate emotional responses.
  - d. Focus on the need for collaboration, not just improved project management.
  - e. Be facilitated by an external facilitator.
2. Those expected to be involved with large complex projects. The Project provides a case study that illustrates the importance of robust project management.

As well, future project management expectations should be clearly communicated to project sponsors, with references to available tools, templates and internal experts.



Training (either internal or external) should be offered to those who will have the role of project sponsor or manager.

Finally, the external interview participants should be acknowledged and provided with feedback from the City Manager or the Deputy City Manager, Community Planning & Development.

---

---

## REQUEST FOR INPUT

---

---

**TO:** PARTICIPANT LIST  
**FROM:** 28(1) Personal , T.BAKKELI CONSULTANTS INC.  
**SUBJECT:** REVIEW OF CITY SQUARE PROJECT MANAGEMENT  
**DATE:** FEBRUARY 5, 2012

### BACKGROUND TO REQUEST

The primary focus of project management is to **plan and execute** a project to meet the following four primary objectives:

- **Scope** – completing the scope of work necessary to meet the intended purpose of the facility.
- **Schedule** – completing the project within the time set for the execution of the project.
- **Quality** – completing the project to meet the functional standards established.
- **Cost** – completing the project within the project budget.

### QUESTIONS

1. Please provide your assessment of the effectiveness of the **project planning** for City Square.
2. Please provide your assessment the effectiveness of **project execution** for City Square.
3. Please provide any other comments that you think would be useful considerations for **future project management**.

The following elements are offered for your consideration, but should not limit your answers to the above questions:

- Scope
- Schedule
- Cost
- Quality
- Communications
- Risks
- Management of suppliers
- Other

Either a written response or an interview (telephone or in-person) can be provided.

28(1) Personal

T. Bakkeli Consultants Inc.

28(1) Personal

---

---

## INTERVIEW GUIDE

---

---

**TO:** INTERVIEW PARTICIPANTS  
**FROM:** 28(1) Personal, T.BAKKELI CONSULTANTS INC.  
**SUBJECT:** REVIEW OF CITY SQUARE PROJECT MANAGEMENT

The City Square Project is a large capital project with significant public visibility. The City Manager has engaged me to provide an independent and systematic review of the project management methods used. This review is expected to identify successful elements of project management as well as improvement targets. The review will identify lessons learned that can be applied to improve future project management.

The project will include a review of the project management documents as well as interviews with or surveys of key project personnel and stakeholders. I would like to gain your input on the following questions. Responses will be compiled and used to develop the project report. If you have any questions about the consulting engagement, please do not hesitate to contact Jason Carlston, Glen Davies or me.

## INTERVIEW GUIDE

The primary focus of project management is to **plan and execute** a project to meet the following four primary objectives:

- **Scope** – completing the scope of work necessary to meet the intended purpose of the facility.
- **Schedule** – completing the project within the time set for the execution of the project.
- **Quality** – completing the project to meet the functional standards established.
- **Cost** – completing the project within the project budget.

1. Describe your role with regards to the City Square project.
2. How would you describe the complexity of this project? Why?
3. What corporate policies and procedures does the City have in place regarding project management? (e.g. budget submission, project management methodology, etc.)?
4. Overall, how would you assess the effectiveness of the project management of City Square? Why?
5. What elements of project initiation and development of the project charter were most effective?
6. How could project initiation and development of the project charter have been improved?
7. What elements of project planning and the project management plan were most effective?
8. How could project planning and the project management plan have been improved?
9. How were project risks identified and managed?
10. What elements of project execution were most effective?
11. How could project execution have been improved?
12. What elements of project monitoring and control were most effective?
13. How could project monitoring and control have been improved?
14. How were major changes to the project reported and approved?
15. Who was accountable for ensuring approval of project changes?
16. How effectively was the project closed?
17. Who was accountable for ensuring the project was completed within the approved scope?
18. Who was accountable for ensuring project quality?
19. Were sufficient resources with the required skill available to manage the project?
20. What lessons learned do you think would be most useful for future projects?
21. What other comments do you think would be useful for this review?

The following elements are offered for your consideration, but should not limit your answers to the above questions:

- |            |                           |
|------------|---------------------------|
| • Scope    | • Communications          |
| • Schedule | • Risks                   |
| • Cost     | • Management of suppliers |
| • Quality  | • Other                   |